



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

THE REPLY OF FANTHAM AND PORTER

It is regrettable certainly that books submitted for review do not always meet with unqualified commendation. Any such book is an objective thing to be treated critically and impartially by the unprejudiced reviewer and the impression made by the book upon the reviewer should be honestly set forth by him. This was the case in the present instance and the concluding remark which the authors feel it best to ignore, was the honest impression made by the book upon the reviewer. As it was an impression made on a reader unacquainted with the authors but familiar with the subjects discussed, the fault must lie in the book.

As for the so-called inaccuracies in the review I will not take the space here to go over the matters which led to the criticisms but will point out some misleading statements in the authors' letter. For example the rather imposing list of names in connection with spirochaetes does not include such careful observers as Novy, Gross or Dobell, whose views regarding so-called longitudinal division are quite different from those of the authors. These are probably included in the "opinions of other investigators also," an example of which, in connection with spirochaetes, may be cited from page 71:

Again, some persons have denied the existence of longitudinal division because they themselves have not observed it. Needless to say, their misfortune does not invalidate the fact of undoubted longitudinal division.

Equally misleading is the reference (2) to *Treponema pallidum*, the spirochaete of syphilis. It is true that the Index on page 318 refers to all that is given on the subject, and we quote it in full:

The parasite of syphilis was first regarded as a spirochaete, but later was renamed *Treponema pallidum*, because the coils of the body were said to be fixed. Balfour recently has shown that *Treponema* is a "granule shedder," i. e., it produces ovoid bodies just as spirochaetes do. In this case it seems very probable that it is only the minuteness of the organism that prevents full knowledge of its internal structure, and that for the same reason its coils appear fixed. There are

undoubted affinities between all of the organisms mentioned, and it seems far better to keep the older nomenclature and not to attempt re-classification until the life-history of each form has been fully elucidated. Building on an insecure foundation has the disadvantage of causing endless patching and emendation later, and the old saying, "More haste, less speed," is as applicable in protozoology as elsewhere (p. 86).

This certainly justifies the criticism in the original review, for even the authors would hesitate to claim that this is a description of the organism of syphilis.

GARY N. CALKINS

A FILEFISH NEW TO THE ATLANTIC COAST OF THE UNITED STATES

WOODS HOLE continues to yield most unexpected ichthyological treasures. The latest addition to the fish fauna of the region is a filefish taken in floating rockweed in Vineyard Sound on September 3, 1914, by Mr. Vinal N. Edwards, the indefatigable collector at the fishery station. The species is *Cantherines pullus*, described in 1842 from Brazil and subsequently taken in Cuba, Porto Rico and Tortugas, but heretofore unknown from the east coast of the United States. The genus *Pseudomonacanthus* Bleeker, 1866, appears to be identical with *Cantherines* Swainson, 1839; and *Pseudomonacanthus amphioxys* (Cope), known only from two young specimens from St. Martin Island, West Indies, is a synonym of *Cantherines pullus* (Ranzani).

My associate Mr. Lewis Radcliffe advises that a comparison of the Woods Hole specimen and another of the same species from Porto Rico with a specimen of the type species of this genus, *Cantherines sandwichiensis* (Quoy and Gaimard), from Honolulu discloses no valid differences. As the latter is recorded from Socorro Island, off the west coast of Mexico, and the young are pelagic, it seems not improbable that a further comparison of a series of specimens from widely separated localities will prove *pullus* to be a synonym of *sandwichiensis*.

H. M. SMITH

BUREAU OF FISHERIES,
WASHINGTON, D. C.